REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the Pending Application and Claims 1-18 have been rejected.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Ogura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,136). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In countries or regions, a standard time is used as a basis for determining a time at which a working time in a company starts or ends, for instance. However, there is a remarkable difference in a sunrise time from season to season, and hence, if a standard time is kept fixed, the daylight time cannot be effectively utilized. To solve this problem, some countries have adapted a system for adjusting a standard time over a limited season. A typical one in such a system is the daylight saving time in which a few hours are advanced relative to a standard time only in summer. In a facsimile machine, date and time at which data receives from other facsimile machines and data transmits to other facsimile machines are all stored in a memory equipped therein. Accordingly, in countries or regions adapting a system for adjusting a standard time, such as the daylight saving time system, it would be necessary to adjust a standard time in accordance with the system. Applicants have discovered a solution to this, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 1 recites a time administrator comprising: (a) a first unit which acts as a clock and transmits a first signal indicative of a standard time; (b) a second unit which makes access to said first unit and receives said first signal; (c) a third unit which judges whether a system for adjusting a current time is adapted and further whether said system is to be applied to said standard time; and (d) a fourth unit which, when said third unit judges that said system is to be applied to said standard time, carries out a specific operation to said standard time, and transmits a second signal indicative of the result of said operation as a current time, and which, when said third unit judges that said system is not to be applied to said standard time, transmits a third signal without carrying out said operation which third signal is indicative of said standard time as a current time.

None of the cited references teach or suggest *using* a *standard time* and *adjusting* the *standard time* to a *current time*. For example, Ogura et al. teaches an image forming device 1

having a control unit which includes a CPU 11, a real time clock circuit 12, a ROM 13, a RAM 14, a nonvolatile RAM 15, an input/output port 16, and serial communication control units 17a, 17b, and 17c. (See Ogura et al., col. 10, lines 33-48) The real time clock circuit 12 includes a time generating unit, a transmission time setting register and a time comparing unit. The time generating unit generates a "current time" (a year, a month, a date, an hour and a minute). The transmission time setting register sets a *data transmission time*, at which an image forming device transmits data related to the image forming device, to the central management unit 6 or the data communication device 7. The *data transmission time*, however, is *different* from a *standard time* or a *current time* as recited in claim 1, since the data transmission time is the time at which the image forming device *transmits data* related to the image forming device.

Moreover, in Ogura et al., the "current time" is compared to a the *data transmission time preset* in a transmission-time setting register merely in order to match the "current time" to the *data transmission time* or to detect passage of a certain period of time (see column 10, lines 64-66). In contrast, in the present invention, the standard time is compared to a *current time*, the standard time is then *adjusted* if necessary, and then the *adjusted standard time* is used *in place of* the *standard time* in accordance with a comparison result.

Additionally, as recited in claims 1, 3, and 6, a *fourth unit* transmits a *second signal* which indicates that the current time is adjusted. Ogura et al. fails to teach the transmission of such a second signal to *adjust* a standard time. Ogura et al. just uses a "current time" or a transmission time as it is, without adjusting them at all. Whereas the present invention *adjusts* a *standard time* by replacing the standard time with an *adjusted standard time,* if necessary.

Furthermore, the present invention transmits a *third signal* to indicate that the standard time is not to be adjusted. The examiner claims that it is inherent in Ogura et al. that a third signal is transmitted if the data transmission time does not match the current time. However, that simply is not what Ogura et al. teaches. Ogura et al. is concerned with transmitting data upon or after a certain time has passed. To this effect, Ogura et al. teaches a time comparing unit which generates *only one signal*, a data transmission requesting signal, which is transmitted if the "current time" and the data transmission time *match* with each other, *or* of the "current time" *passes* the data-transmission time. There would be no need to for the time comparing unit of Ogura et al. to

generate some third signal, which the Examiner believes is inherent, if the data transmission time does not match the "current time," since the time comparing unit is not concerned at all with this scenario. For example, if the "current time" is actually *before* the data transmission time, there is no need for the time comparing unit to transmit a signal, even though the "current time" would not in this case match the data transmission time, the time comparing unit could just remain silent. Therefore, since such a third signal is not taught specifically by Ogura et al., and since there would not be any reason to transmit such a third signal, Applicants maintain that such a third signal would also not be inherent within Ogura et al.

For these and other reasons, the cited art does not disclose the subject matter defined by independent Claim 1, 3, 6, 9 and 13. Therefore, Claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 13 are allowable along with all claims which depend from the same for the same reasons and also because they recite additional patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant maintains that the application is in condition for allowance. If Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

Dated: 1/17/2007

By: _____

David Rozenblat, Reg. No. 47,044
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
Two Prudential Plaza
180 N. Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 222-0800
Fax: (312) 222-0818

Atty Docket No. 205105-9001